DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 316 95 JC 750 594

AUTHOR	Lombardi, John
TITLE	Part-Time Faculty in Community Colleges. Topical Paper No. 54.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	TP-54
PUB DATE	Dec 75
NOTE	62p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; Collective Bargaining; College Faculty; Faculty Organizations; Faculty Recruitment; *Junior Colleges; *Part Time Teachers; *Salary Differentials; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; Teacher Qualifications; *Teacher Welfare; Teaching Load

ABSTRACT

The number of part-time faculty in the community college has dramatically increased in recent years. The trend to hire more part-time instructors will likely continue, due to the increasing numbers of part-time students, the movement toward off-campus classes in scattered locations, and the growing numbers of unemployed college graduates with teaching majors. Meanwhile, important issues related to part-time faculty are being debated: pay of part-time instructors, the number of day part-time faculty and their ratio to full-time instructors, their inclusion or exclusion as members of the bargaining unit where collective bargaining exists, and their rights and responsibilities in the department and in the college. The author delineates the different perspectives on these issues held by administrators, and full-time and part-time faculty. The present situation is described in the major sections of the paper: definition, number, sources, qualifications, academic preparation, experience, workload, and wage rates of part-time instructors. He concludes with the implications of these data on the future of community colleges and their staffs. (Author/RL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED115316

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PART-TIME FACULTY IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

John Lombardi

Topical Paper No. 54

December 1975

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
University of California
Los Angeles 90024

JC 750 394

The material in this Topical Paper was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the California Community and Junior College Association for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the California Community and Junior College Association or the National Institute of Education.

For information about the availability of other Topical Papers, contact the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 96 Powell Library, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024.

PREFACE

This Topical Paper is a natural outgrowth of Topical Paper 46, Faculty Workload and Topical Paper 50, Riding the Wave of New Enrollments. As work progressed on the Faculty Workload paper it became evident that such subjects as number, employment status, qualifications, remuneration and other aspects of part-time faculty appeared with increasing frequency during the late 1960's and 1970's in legislative hearings, in court cases, collective bargaining agreements, the journals of the local affiliates and national organizations of the AFT-CIO and NEA, and in the secondary sources. Although the sources and other references on part-time students were more discrete, it seemed a reasonable assumption that a relationship existed between part-time students and the part-time instructors. In fact the phenomenal growth of part-time instructors paralleled the similar growth of part-time students. A thesis that seemed reasonable is that the growth of the part-time student enrollment was in large part subsidized by the low wages of part-time instructors. Part-time students and part-time instructors flourished as adult and basic adult education programs and weekend and off-campus classes expanded.

Taken together the three Topical Papers cover areas of concern to those involved in the governance of the public two-year colleges. Ultimately, the colleges must address themselves to the effects these phenomena have on the finances, the quality of the educational program and their future role as a segment of higher education. In this Topical Paper as in the others the treatment is descriptive, analytical and empirical.

The Paper is divided into eight sections. An overview of the part-time faculty situation in modern times is followed by sections on definition, number, sources, qualifications, workloads, wage rates, and a summary and conclusion.

Grateful acknowledgment is extended to the leaders of faculty organizations, college administrators and state board officers for their generous response to requests for information and documents such as collective bargaining agreements, college policies and reports on part-time and full-time faculty; to the staff of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges who

conducted the search for available documents in the ERIC system; and particularly to Patricia Rose Sweeney and Mark Earnest who assisted in classification of materials and Bonnie Sanchez who prepared the bibliography and typed the manuscript. Marcia Boyer did the final editorial review and coordinated production.

Arthur M. Cohen, Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, edited the manuscript and made suggestions for clarification and highlighting important observations and conclusions.

John Lombardi, Research Educationist
ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

PART-TIME FACULTY IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by John Lombardi

Overview

Part-time, substitute, adjunct, supplemental instructors have multiplied almost as fast as part-time students. Responsible for this phenomenon are the decline in the rate of enrollment growth, the straitened financial condition of many colleges, and the growth of off-campus, outreach, weekend and evening programs. The proliferation of the day part-time and other non-regular instructors is causing concern to many groups--the full-time faculty, the leaders of professional organizations, and college administrators, each of which has its own interest in this new development. Controversy over the employment of part-time instructors has led to legislative inquiries, bills to restrict the practice, and surveys to find out its extent.

Prior to 1965 the issues revolved around pay and, to a lesser extent, the rights of regular day instructors to the extra-pay or overload assignments. Since then others have come to the fore. Pay is still the major issue but causing as much difficulty are issues relating to the number of day part-time instructors and their proportion to full-time instructors, their inclusion or exclusion as members of the bargaining unit where collective bargaining exists, and their rights and responsibilities in the department and in the college.

There is, of course, the very personal interest of the part-time instructors whose assignments are for fixed periods with no assurance of continuity and at a rate of pay far below that of the regular full-time instructors. At the other extreme are the administrators who created the problem because:

- they were confronted with serious budgetary limitations particularly during the late 1960's;
- they saw the savings possible in hiring part-time instead of full-time instructors;

- they needed to tap new sources of instructors with special skills for regular or experimental programs that had a high probability of low enrollment or uncertainty of success, not justifying commitments for full-time instructors;
- during the teacher shortage of the 1950's and early 1960's they had to recruit instructors who were willing to undertake a part-time assignment but not a full-time (Heinberg, 1966);
- it is an "efficient way of dealing with sudden shifts in enrollments" (Scully, 1975, p. 4).

Between the part-timers and the administrators are the full-time faculty members whose interests range from an idealistic concern for the welfare of the part-time instructors to the selfish protection of their own priority rights to part-time overload assignments and the raising of their pay for these assignments to parity with their regular scale.

For many part-timers these issues are not important. This group includes those with special skills who have full-time jobs outside the college, and teach a class or two during the evening with only minor responsibility outside the class assignment. They are not interested in governance on the departmental or college level. They get their satisfaction from being associated with a collegiate institution, performing in an occupation that still commands respect from a large segment of the population, and particularly, in sharing their special talents with others (Williams, 1972). The unconcerned group also includes those full-time faculty members who do not care for extra-pay assignments and who show little interest in any activity beyond their classroom duties.

But the majority of full-time and part-time instructors are involved. The former, whether or not they teach overload classes, have concerns touching on priority to overload assignments, the proportion of day part-time instructors to full-time, their qualifications, the quality of their services, their role in the governance of the department, their status as members of the bargaining unit and their rate of pay.

The part-time instructors who are not otherwise employed have a greater economic interest in the issues than any other group. They depend on the part-time assignment for part of their livelihood; some must work at two or more colleges in order to earn the equivalent of the lowest paid full-time instructor, usually without fringe benefits. Many of them want fringe benefits, and continuous assignment along with such intangibles as participation in departmental and college affairs, office space, inclusion by name in the schedule of classes, and parking privileges. Many accept a part-time assignment because they have not been able to get a full-time assignment and/or they believe that a part-time assignment increases their chances of obtaining a full-time job at the same college or at another college. Part-time teaching gives them experience, frequently a prerequisite for appointment to a full-time position. As Phair points out, experience is important in seeking a full-time job in a restricted labor market, for "many of the new full-time staff hire (in California colleges) show a background of teaching at the community college level on a part-time basis.... Colleges have been hiring part-time staff in large numbers for so many years that the bloc of experienced community college people are making an ever-increasing and successful assault on vacancies for full-time staff positions" (Phair, 1974, pp. 4-6).

The same issues affect non-regular instructors variously classified as substitutes to distinguish them from the regular probationary and tenured faculty members. The members of this group may be full-time (long term) substitutes or part-time substitutes. The part-time substitutes may be employed on a day-to-day basis or for a fixed period--a week, month, or longer. Members of this group usually do not acquire probationary status and nearly always receive less pay than the regular instructors. The long term substitutes receive more pay than the part-time instructors. Their compensation, as that of the regular full-time instructors, is based on academic preparation and teaching experience, but usually at a lower rate.

On some of the issues the full-time and part-time instructors are in accord; on others they are on opposite sides. One must always keep in mind that the dichotomy between full-time and part-time instructors is not sharply delineated since many full-timers also take part-time assignments. In fact, statistics on the number and proportion of part-time teachers on

a college staff usually include everyone with a part-time assignment whether or not they are full-time instructors. Accordingly, at times in this discussion it will be necessary to focus on part-time teaching rather than part-time teachers because many full-time instructors engage in part-time teaching on an overload assignment basis. Obviously, full-time instructors who also teach overload do not have problems relating to status and privileges since they carry all of the perquisites of their regular position (but not necessarily the pay) to their part-time positions.

For the outsiders who are part-timers the situation is far different in this respect. They soon learn if they did not know it earlier, that although full-time instructors insist on a large measure of self-governance in their department or division they are not egalitarians. Neither are they philanthropists. They guard their priority privilege to evening overload assignments even though by asserting it, part-time instructors are displaced. Part-time instructors have little, if any, say in departmental matters, course content, curriculum development, or textbook selection (Guichard and Others, 1975). They are the first to go in economy moves dictated by enrollment declines or a drop in income (Lombardi, 1974). In recent years faculty organization leaders have tried to ameliorate these conditions but the task is not simple. Tenure and seniority are assets that cannot be easily tampered with nor can the privileges they convey be easily modified without antagonizing the full-time instructors. A few colleges have solved this problem by hiring only regular full-time instructors for day and evening or by eliminating overload assignments for full-time instructors.

Faculty organization leaders have some serious concerns with the multiplication of part-time instructors, particularly those employed during the day. In the first place, because of the large numbers of part-time instructors, they are ambivalent about admitting them to membership in their organization. The increased financial contribution part-time instructors' dues would make must be balanced against the prospect of the organization being taken over by the more numerous part-timers. In the second place, part-time instructors pose a threat to the full-time instructors--not only do they teach at a lower rate of pay, they are more amenable

to administrative direction, less able to resist demands for greater productivity in terms of class size, and they constitute a source of replacements in case of a strike. As a practical matter, many organization leaders are accepting part-time instructors as members while working to reduce their numbers in the college by contractual provisions.

Recent collective bargaining agreements contain provisions that include part-time instructors in the bargaining unit and/or define a regular instructor in terms of the number of hours taught or of the proportion of the normal load. Thus, instructors who formerly were part-time instructors are classified as regular instructors with all of the privileges of full-time instructors and paid on a prorata basis of the regular salary schedule. A consequence of this development is the anomalous situation of instructors in some institutions teaching 75 percent to 90 percent of a normal load classified as part-time while instructors in other institutions teaching 50 percent or less of a full load classified as regular instructors.

Administrators also have self-serving and idealistic reasons for hiring part-time in preference to full-time instructors. In addition to the tremendous advantage of lower cost and greater control, they claim that part-time instructors provide them with a wealth of talent and experience of individuals who do not wish full-time assignments; in case of declining enrollment or financial stringency they can be separated with very little difficulty thereby protecting the tenured instructors, not to mention avoiding the disagreeable task of dropping tenured instructors; and they make it easy to staff outpost classes that rarely have enough students to justify full-time instructors.

Whatever the merits of the various claims of administrators and faculty, the part-time instructors consider themselves "marginal, expendable, underprivileged, underpaid" (Scully, 1975, p. 1). According to Cortland P. Auser, director of a Modern Language Association survey, they "see their positions as one (of being) continually in limbo;" since they "cannot plan further than one term ahead, for there are few, if any, yearly contracts." Also galling is that "their futures (are) based upon the whims of the chairmen" (Scully, 1975, p. 4). Anderson, a management consultant,

"discovered...that there is no lower form of educational being than a part-time teacher" (1975, p. 8).

They are also uneasy at the sink-or-swim milieu in which they are placed on assignment. Aside from the name of the text, the location of the classroom, occasionally a course syllabus, part-time instructors get little orientation or in-service training from the administration (Williams 1972). They are given over to chairpersons who are nominally their mentors and guides. The amount of attention they receive from these harried and overworked semi-administrators is not difficult to guess--it is minimal and it may reach the vanishing point for part-time instructors assigned in off-campus locations miles from the campus (Heinberg, 1966). Part-time instructors who depend upon teaching for a livelihood are the pariahs of the profession (Phair, 1972).

On the other hand quite a few part-timers prefer part-time teaching. Auser reported that 40 percent of his respondents and an Educational Testing Service survey found 80 percent who preferred part-time status (Scully, 1975). These surveys are not necessarily contradictory since many who prefer part-time teaching may be as dissatisfied with their status as those who accept such an assignment by necessity.

The unfavorable conditions of part-time employment, particularly as they relate to pay and job security, and the inability of the regular organization leaders to reconcile the interests of the full-time instructors and those of the part-time instructors has led to the formation of part-time teacher organizations. These include the Adjunct Faculty Organization of 6,000 part-timers in New York City (Scully, 1975) and the Northwest Part-Time Instructors Association of Washington (Washington State Board for Community College Education, 1975). The New York City group maintains affiliation with the Professional Staff Congress, a consortium of unions, but its leaders and members do not feel that the Congress adequately represents their interests. The part-timers in New York City went through a disastrous year in 1974-75 and face a more bleak 1975-76 as more cuts are made to balance the budget. The Northwest Association is making its appeal for better pay and fringe benefits directly to the legislature. If the

trend toward hiring part-time instructors continues, more independent part-time organizations will undoubtedly be formed.

Even while the issues are being debated the trend toward hiring part-time instructors shows little sign of abating. And it is happening at a time when the market for teachers is at its lowest point in more than a decade, thereby aggravating an already serious unemployment problem for college graduates with teaching majors. The movement toward off-campus classes in scattered locations will almost certainly accelerate this trend since satellites with small enrollments require part-time instructors for one or two classes per instructor rather than a few full-time instructors. Where satellites are close to each other the employment of some full-time instructors to serve at two or more locations is possible, but little of this is done. It is much easier administratively to appoint different instructors at the various satellites.

In the following pages an analysis will be made of the size and composition of the part-time instructors in the public two-year colleges; their rapid growth and source; their qualifications; their treatment in collective bargaining agreements and in college policies; their classifications including fringe benefits if any; their role in the governance of the department/division; and their effect on the quality of teaching and learning.

Definitions

Definitions of part-time status are becoming more precise as collective bargaining agreements multiply, as court decisions are delivered, and as part-time instructors organize. For example, every collective bargaining agreement and most laws define the categories of employees who are or may be included in the employee bargaining group. Court decisions, by defining the rights of various categories of employees to continuity of employment, are forcing educators to reexamine their policies regarding the employment status of their various classes of employees (Lombardi, 1974).

There is of course no uniform definition of a part-time instructor. Broadly speaking, the part-time instructor teaches less than the number

of hours per week normally assigned to a full-time instructor. This definition is the most widely used in colleges that are not constrained by law or by collective bargaining agreements. It covers most of the instructors who teach in the late afternoon and evening, in a day class or two, in outpost classes, or on weekends, but who are not regular members of the faculty. For statistical purposes full-time instructors, administrators, or other staff members who teach a class or two as an overload are also classified as part-time instructors for that portion of their assignment.

In collective bargaining agreements and in college policies a part-time instructor may be anyone who teaches fewer than a certain number of hours per week, usually eight (Henry Ford Community College, 1973-75), or anyone whose load is less than a percentage or fraction of the normal load; two-thirds at the Community College of Baltimore (1974) or "one-fourth of average contract load of full-time members in respective departments" at Lansing Community College in Michigan (1971, p. 3).

Almost as common is to define a part-time instructor indirectly by defining a full-time instructor. Thus, those who do not meet the definition of a full-time instructor "as anyone teaching at least 50 percent of a normal teaching schedule" (Madison Area Technical College, 1973, p. 1) or "working more than 14 hours per week and more than 100 work days per year" (Minnesota Junior College, 1973, p. 1) is a part-time instructor.

Under California Law "any person who is employed to teach adult or junior college classes for not more than 60 percent of the hours per week considered a full-time assignment for permanent employees having comparable duties shall be classified as a temporary employee, and shall not become a probationary employee..." (California Education Code, Section 13337.5). Those teaching more than the 60 percent mentioned are entitled to probationary status and to pay prorated at the regular salary schedule rates.

For the purposes of this report the definition of a part-time instructor includes:

1. instructors on- or off-campus day, late afternoon and/or evening or weekend classes who are not members of the full-time staff. Instructors who teach more

than a specified number or fraction of hours per week but less than the normal workload of the full-time instructor as defined by law, college policy or collective bargaining agreement are regular staff members--but for statistical purposes they are usually considered part-time instructors;

2. full-time instructors, administrators and other staff members of a college who teach one or two (rarely more than two) classes as an overload assignment;
3. counselors, librarians, and other professionals assigned on an hourly or fractional basis. Some colleges do not include these as part-time instructors; most do.

Not included are part-time instructors, usually called substitutes, who teach on a day-to-day basis as the occasion may arise.

Part-Time Workloads

Almost universally colleges prescribe limits on the number of hours per week and/or on the number of courses a part-time instructor may teach. These rules apply to regular full-time instructors and part-time instructors not otherwise affiliated with the college. The practice of limiting part-time assignments has existed for a long time. Where formerly these limits were established unilaterally by administrators or by state boards, lately they have become the subject of bargaining between faculty representatives and administrators. Collective bargaining agreements often contain a section dealing with workloads for part-time instructors and for full-time instructors with an overload assignment. These limits may be from one hour per week to the number of hours that does not "exceed a full-time teacher's contractural limitations" (Macomb County Community College, 1972, p. 2) or "one course in which the credit hour does not exceed five" (Illinois Junior College Board, 1971, p. 28). Most of the agreements limit each instructor to one or two classes averaging two to six hours per week. Frequently, full-time instructors are limited to one additional class or three hours per week (Waubonsee Community College, 1973-1975); rarely are they permitted more than two classes or six hours. There is understandably more

variation on the upper limits for part-time instructors not otherwise employed by the college.

An Illinois study reported that 74.4 percent of 3,097 part-time instructors taught one to 25 percent of a full load. Another 20.5 percent taught 26 to 50 percent of a full load. The rest, 5.1 percent, taught from 51 to 99 percent of a full load (Table I). Assuming an average teaching load between 12 and 20 hours, these percentages may be translated into two to five hours, six to ten hours, and ten to twenty hours respectively (Illinois Junior College Board, 1973). The 3,097 part-time instructors represented 677 full-time teaching equivalents (FTE) or 13.1 percent of the total FTE. Of 63 California colleges responding to Heinberg's question on workload, 41 reported a limit of six hours; ten reported three hours, six were evenly divided between four and seven hours, and six had no limit (Heinberg, 1966).

TABLE I

Number and Percent of Part-Time Faculty and Load
Illinois Community Colleges
1972-73

	Number of Part-Time Faculty	Number & Percent of Part-Time Faculty Teaching "X" Percent of Full Load			
		1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-99%
Number	3,097	2,305	634	106	52
Percent	100	74.4%	20.5%	3.4%	1.7%

Source: Illinois Junior College Board, 1973, p. 4.

Because of recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions, restrictive state laws, and collective bargaining agreements, most work loads of untenured part-time teachers will remain in the low range of four to seven hours per week. Administrators are reluctant to assign more than one or two classes when by doing so the part-time instructors gain job security and/or must be paid proportionately the same salary as a full-time instructor with the same qualifications and years of experience. For many part-time instructors

the limits impose no hardship since they do not have the time or energy to undertake more. But for those without supplemental employment the limit does present a handicap.

Number of Part-Time Instructors

Despite the increased interest in part-time instructors, statistics on their number and proportion are spotty and difficult to interpret, a condition that results from the different definitions of part-time instructors. One cannot usually tell from the data how many of the part-time instructors have no other assignment with the college and how many have full-time assignments (not necessarily teaching) at the same college, a different college, or in a non-educational establishment. There is even less information on the number of part-time instructors who have part-time assignments at two or more colleges.

Comparisons of part-time and full-time instructors are given either for the year or, most frequently, for the fall term. Yearly figures weight the numbers in favor of part-time instructors since adult, continuation, weekend and outreach classes may be started at any time whereas credit classes usually start only two or three times during the year. The fall term figures tend to tip the balance in favor of full-time instructors. National statistics do not always include all of the part-time instructors teaching adult education and non-credit classes. Some states, such as Iowa, and some districts (e.g., San Diego Community College in California and the City Colleges of Chicago in Illinois), do not include statistics on adult education or skill center programs in their reports to national collecting agencies such as the Directory of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (Lombardi, 1975).

Notwithstanding these problems in data reporting, the trend in the employment of part-time instructors has been upward since the early 1960's and has accelerated sharply during the last three years. In 1962 the National Education Association Research Division reported that part-time instructors comprised 38.5 percent of the instructors in 698 junior colleges (Heinberg, 1966). By 1971 the percentage had increased moderately

to 40 but by 1974 the percentage had grown to 49.7 (Table II). The increase in number of part-time instructors is even more impressive--from 11,530 in 1962 to 48,855 in 1971 and 80,257 in 1974. By 1974 there were more part-time than full-time instructors in at least 16 states (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974).

TABLE II

Part-Time and Full-Time Faculty
1962, 1970, 1974

	1962		1970		1974	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Part-Time	11,530	38.5	48,855	40	80,527	49.7
Full-Time	18,452	61.5	73,282	60	81,658	50.3
Total	29,982		122,138		162,185	

Source: Bender and Breuder, 1973.

Some state reports show more spectacular changes. One of the most consistent growth patterns of part-time instructors may be observed in the yearly reports for the Florida colleges beginning in 1961-1962 when the 363 part-time instructors represented 36 percent of the total. Except for a slight drop from 1966 to 1967, the number of part-time instructors increased in every year until it reached 4384 in fiscal year 1975. From 1961-62 to 1969-70 the ratio of part-time to full-time instructors varied from a low of 26 to 74 in 1961-62 to a high of 40-60 in 1966-67, with a mode of 36 to 64 (Florida Department of Education, 1971). Since 1970-71 the proportion of part-time instructors has climbed upward until in 1974-75 it reached 53 percent of the total.

During the same period the number of full-time instructors also showed consistent growth until it reached a high of 4240 in 1969-70. Since then the number has fluctuated between 3739 and 4090. In the fiscal year 1975 the 3900 full-time instructors represented a decline of 8 percent from the high of 1969-70 contrasted with a growth rate for part-time instructors of 78 percent (Table III). The large increase of part-time instructors since 1970 is largely attributable to the expansion of adult and

adult basic education fields.

TABLE III

Selected Data on Part-Time and Full-Time Instructors
Florida Community College
1960-61 to 1974-75

	1960-61[a]		1969-70[a]		1974-75[b]		1969-70 to 1974-75 Increase (Decrease)	
Instructors	No.	Percent of Total	No.	Percent of Total	No.	Percent of Total	No.	Percent
Part-Time	435	36	2461	37	4384	53	1923	78
Full-Time	760	64	4240	63	3900	47	(340)	(8)
Total	1195	100	6701	100	8284	100	1583	24

Sources: [a]Florida Department of Education, 1971, p. 140.

[b]Lauffer, 1975.

Less consistent, but nevertheless moving in the same upward direction is the record of part-time employment in the Illinois colleges. From 1966 to 1970 part-time instructors comprised from 45.5 percent to 51.7 percent of the faculty. After a sharp drop in 1971 to 34.1 percent, the proportion rose to 40.8 percent in 1972, 48.6 percent in 1973 and 63.4 percent in 1974 (Table IV).

An earlier and more pronounced upward trend is evident in California. In 1966 Heinberg reported that 90 percent of the colleges employed more part-time than full-time instructors. As he predicted it would, this disparity has since increased. In 1975 Ross found that only one district (San Francisco) of 67 districts reporting, had fewer part-time than full-time instructors. Forty districts had more than twice the number of part-timers as full-timers (Ross, 1975). The overall ratio of part-time to full-time instructors was 67.2 to 32.8 (Table V).

Ross also obtained information on the number of part-time instructors teaching in the day division. As shown in Table V he reported that 17

TABLE IV

Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty
Illinois Community Colleges 1966-1974

Fall	Full-Time	%	Part-Time	%	Total
1966[a]	1399	51.5	1319	48.5	2718
1967[a]	2064	54.5	1724	45.5	3788
1968[b]	2738	53.0	2441	47.0	5179
1969[b]	3141	48.3	3358	51.7	6499
1970[c]	3854	51.6	3620	48.4	7474
1971[d]	4363	65.9	2260	34.1	6623
1972[e]	4491	59.2	3097	40.8	7588
1973[f]	4721	51.4	4459	48.6	9180
1974[g]	4521	36.6	7821	63.4	12,342

Sources: [a]Illinois Junior College Board, 1968, p. 42.
[b]Illinois Junior College Board, 1970, p. 4.
[c]Illinois Junior College Board, 1971, Table 16.
[d]Illinois Junior College Board, 1972, pp. 4-5.
[e]Illinois Junior College Board, 1973, pp. 3-4.
[f]Illinois Junior College Board, 1974, p. 3.
[g]Illinois Community College Board, 1975, p. 11.

percent or 2,873 day instructors were part-timers and 83 percent or 13,778 were full-time. The ratio of part-time to full-time varied from 1 to 1.5 to 1 to 46 with an average close to 1 to 5. Only two districts did not employ part-time instructors for day classes.

TABLE I

Day Part-Time and Full-Time Faculty
California Colleges 1974-75
67 to 69 Districts

Classification	Number	Percent
Part-Time	2,873	17.3
Full-Time	13,778	82.7
Total Day Faculty	16,651	100.0
Full-Time Teaching Part-Time	6,282	45.6

Source: Ross, 1975.

Statistics on the number of part-time instructors in the two-year colleges confirm that they have become the majority of instructors. While the great majority of part-time instructors are still found in the late afternoon and evening classes, a significant number are teaching during the day. The growth of the latter practice is causing the greatest concern among the faculty and their organizations and also among the part-time instructors who feel they are being exploited by the administrators in the tight job market of the last five years. Today's glut of instructors is in contrast to their scarcity during the 1950's and 1960's when interest in the employment of part-time instructors was also high albeit for different reasons (Heinberg, 1966). As long as administrators are not constrained by law or collective bargaining agreements they will continue to employ lower paid part-time instructors, probably in larger numbers than in the past, as one means of effecting savings.

Control on Part-Time Employment

Provisions to control the number of part-time instructors teaching day classes appear frequently in state laws and in collective bargaining agreements. Most are still in the nature of a policy of intent, but some are restrictive. Illustrative of a generalized policy that gives the administrator considerable latitude is the Maryland standard that "A substantial portion of the course work should be taught by full-time faculty members" (Maryland State Department of Education, 1969, p. 3). In collective bargaining agreements the controls are usually more explicit. The Macomb County Community College (Michigan) contract states that "The Board shall not seek the employment of part-time teachers for the purpose of reducing the number of professional staff by replacing full-time teachers except when a full-time teacher has been given a leave of absence." Moreover, "no part-time teacher may be given assignments that exceed a full-time teacher's contractual limitations" (1972, p. 2). These are further defined as 22 equated hours annually, 16 equated hours during the academic year and nine equated hours during one trimester. The Wisconsin Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education District 4 statement is prescriptive: "Whenever there is sufficient teaching load in a full-time program, the Board will employ a full-time instructor rather than several part-time teachers" (Madison Area Technical College, 1973, p. 23). Similar provisions appear in contracts at Hutchinson Community Junior College (1973) and Schenectady Community College (1972-1975). Most of the above regulations apply to part-time day positions, not necessarily to evening division or special short- or limited-term assignments.

Another method of discouraging the employment of part-time instructors is to remove the most powerful incentive for the practice--lower pay. This is done by requiring that those teaching a certain percentage of a full-load be paid at the regular salary schedule rates prorated to the percentage of time taught--35 percent at Minnesota Junior College (1973); 60 percent at Charles Stewart Mott Community College in Michigan (1973-75); 12 hours at Erie Community College, New York; eight hours at Henry Ford Community College, Michigan (1973-75).

A third method, incorporated in the Seattle Community College bargaining agreement, stipulates that "the part-time faculty headcount will be reduced by 20 percent by the Spring quarter, 1973" and that the percentage of reduction will be based upon the daytime part-time headcount of Fall quarter 1971 (1972-73, p. 6). Similarly, by the terms of the Oakland Community College (Michigan) contract the number of part-time instructors is limited to 25 percent of the full-time faculty headcount (1973-75), while the Washtenaw Community College (Michigan) agreement places a limit of 40 percent of the full-time credit hours generated by the full-time faculty (1973-75).

The newly-formed Seattle-based Northwest Part-Time Instructors' Association defines the proper use of part-time faculty "as employment to meet peak enrollments, teaching of specialty courses offered only occasionally, and for courses requiring instruction by professional specialists such as lawyers" (Washington State Board for Community College Education, 1975, p. 3). The use of part-time instructors as a money-saving device is deemed improper.

Most part-time instructors are hired on a semester or quarter basis, subject to termination or continuance at the option of the administration. Informally some administrators may assure employment for a year but this does not guarantee continuance if the enrollment should decline in the next semester or quarter. In Seattle a contractual arrangement is possible where "At the discretion of the division/department chairman and within budgetary allocations, a member or members of the part-time faculty may be issued annual part-time contracts which guarantee a minimum work load during a regular academic year. Pay under such contracts will be at the applicable rate for part-time faculty" (Seattle Community College, 1972-73, p. 10).

The college contract assigning the part-time instructor will usually include the beginning date and the termination date in order to protect the college or district against a claim of expectancy of continued employment (Lombardi, 1974) as defined in two U.S. Supreme Court decisions, Board of Regents v. Roth and Perry v. Sindermann, both handed down on

June 29, 1972. In brief the Court held that:

1. An instructor with a formal notice of appointment to start September 1, 1968 and end June 30, 1969 secured no guarantee that his contract would be renewed.
2. An instructor employed on a year-to-year basis had the right to a hearing to prove whether or not his claim of de facto tenure was justified by virtue of custom and practice. If it were, then he had a property interest in continued employment protected by the Fourteenth Amendment.
3. An untenured instructor was entitled to a hearing if the nonrenewal of employment was alleged to be for an infringement of his First Amendment rights (O'Brien, 1974, p. 180).

While these efforts will retard the unprecedented growth of the past few years they will hardly eliminate the practice of employing part-time instructors. Even the full-time instructors would not wish to see this happen. For the administrators the non-financial advantages of hiring part-timers still hold. Moreover, it is still less expensive to employ a part-time instructor even at prorata pay for certain courses requiring special skills or having low enrollments than hiring a full-time instructor for whom it may be difficult to provide a normal load.

If prorata pay is adopted more widely the effect may be for more rather than fewer part-time instructors since with prorata pay comes more security for the instructor and probably prorata tenure based on the proportion of a full load. Such part-time instructors will not be as prone as the untenured to give up their part-time employment. There will also be a greater inducement to seek such assignments by those who prefer part-time to full-time employment. With a large corps of such part-time instructors their influence on hiring practices may give unemployed teachers greater priority to part-time employment than they now possess.

A financial crisis or an enrollment decline will have more immediate effect on lowering the number of part-time instructors than any of the

restrictive devices proposed by faculty organizations. If the staff is reduced under either circumstance day part-time instructors are the first to be dropped from the staff followed by the evening part-time instructors.

But, even after taking into account the restrictive devices proposed by the faculty organizations including prorata pay and the probability of a financial crisis or enrollment decline the number of part-time instructors will continue to increase during the next three or four years. Either of the two contingencies will have a greater impact on the number of on-campus day part-time instructors than on the number teaching in the evening, adult, continuing education and community services classes. Also, the movement to organize classes close to the student's home, workplace or other location (hospitals, convalescent homes, military base or correctional institution) which shows no signs of abating will contribute to the employment of part-time instructors, day and evening, since these classes will be staffed primarily by them rather than by full-time instructors.

Sources of Part-Time Faculty

The large numbers of part-time faculty come from five principal sources: day faculty, other colleges, K-12 schools, non-educational fields, recent university graduates. The proportion that comes from each source will be influenced by such factors as the nature of the educational program, the location of the college, and the college policy on the number of overload units or classes a day instructor may teach. Colleges with large occupational programs rely heavily on business, government and industry for part-time instructors in related fields. Quite a few part-time instructors recruited from non-educational fields are professionals in medicine, law, government, and accounting qualified to teach specialized and regular academic or transfer courses.

Colleges in metropolitan areas where a large number of schools and colleges are located have a wider choice of candidates for part-time work than those in rural areas with few educational institutions. Likewise, instructors in metropolitan areas have many part-time opportunities while for instructors in rural areas they are almost non-existent. It is likely

that in the rural colleges a larger proportion of the part-time instructors are recruited from among regular day faculty than is true in metropolitan areas. In the few colleges that assign full-time instructors to day and/or evening classes the source of the few part-time instructors needed will be from outside the college.

In colleges that attempt to prevent moonlighting by the faculty and staff, the sources will all be from outside the college. A paragraph in the Lansing Community College (Michigan) contract reads:

> Teaching is a profession and this demands that faculty members consider their position at the College as a full-time occupation. The Association recognizes that it, too, is an advocate of this concept. If instances occur where it becomes apparent that a faculty member is violating the spirit and intent of this concept, either the Association or the administration shall make the facts known to each other and shall jointly recommend appropriate action. If the administration and the Association do not agree on the disposition of the matter, it is then subject to the provisions of the Grievance Procedure (1971, pp. 13-14).

Not quite as rigorous as the Lansing Community College policy is that followed by Mount Royal College (Alberta) which specifies that unemployed teachers have first priority to part-time assignments, full-time faculty have second priority, and administrators have third priority. However for non-credit community services courses offered after 5 p.m. Mount Royal College gives full-time day faculty equal or higher priority than any other group. It is even possible under controlled conditions for a faculty member to receive an assignment before 5 p.m., especially if he is involved in the development of new non-credit programs and in the implementation of programs outside the normal college day. This exception to the general policy was implemented with some reluctance and reservation by the administration. In a memorandum the Dean of Instruction made the observation that:

"The insistence on the part of certain individuals that an instructor can effectively handle only so many students per day as well as a limit on the number of student contact hours per week, is clearly in conflict with the concurrent request to be allowed to take on an extra workload in order to participate in non-credit course programs. The very existence of this conflict has, in many respects, accounted for the long delay in promulgating a statement of policy. The policy statement (on non-credit courses) is an attempt to create a situation where faculty have an opportunity to develop and teach on a temporary basis until such a time as it is felt that all the problems have been ironed out and it is workable and acceptable to all concerned" (Mount Royal College, 1974).

These illustrations are the exceptions. Many colleges are forced by faculty pressure to give priority to day instructors; most permit, or even encourage day instructors to accept part-time assignments since it reduces administrative red-tape in the assignment process and provides for evening classes instructors with the same academic qualifications and experience as those who teach day classes--and at lower pay. They are "pedagogical moonlighters, the colleges' cheap labor reserve" (Blinderman, 1971, p. 12).

Surveys of the sources of part-time faculty go back a long time. Kennedy found that in 1964, 54 percent of the part-time faculty teaching in 19 of the 26 Illinois colleges had been recruited from secondary schools. At the same time 11 of the 12 Maryland colleges recruited only 26 percent from that source since they were able to tap the large group of full-time government employees to the extent of 34 percent (Kennedy, 1967). Kennedy observed that Maryland educators probably relied on government workers because of their availability, high educational qualifications and the prestige (or image) such employees gave the colleges.

A 1966 study of the source of part-time faculty in Illinois showed that the secondary and elementary schools provided 44.2 percent of all part-time instructors, business and industry 23.6 percent and junior

colleges 15.0 percent. The rest came from senior colleges, homemakers and others (Illinois Junior College Board, 1967). Six years later, in a survey of 116 colleges with more part-time than full-time instructors, Bender and Breuder found that the three most frequently mentioned sources were local high school, full-time faculty employed at own institution and professional people in the community. Trailing were housewives, graduate students, businessmen and applicants for full-time positions on trial (1973). Ross (1975) found that in 1974, 45.2 of the evening division part-time faculty in California were recruited from non-educational fields, 32.1 percent from the day faculty, 18.8 percent from the K-12 schools and 3.8 percent from other colleges. Ross did not obtain information on the source of day division part-time instructors. From personal inquiries and from annual studies made by Phair (1972) it is reasonable to conclude that a large part of the day part-time instructors were recruited from unemployed teaching graduates, senior colleges, business and industry, and women who did not want full-time assignments. In some specialized fields such as dental hygiene and dental assistants, real estate, and registered nursing, part-time instructors were recruited from professionals in the appropriate fields. The recruits from the K-12 are still an important source for evening division staffs but in California and Illinois they are becoming a smaller fraction of the total.

An Illinois study of the proportion of women and men among the part-time instructors revealed very little difference in the proportion of part-time women instructors and full-time women instructors employed. As shown in Table VI women comprised 35.3 percent of the part-time faculty and 34.5 percent of the full-time. An even closer relationship existed between the ratio of part-time women to full-time staff. For total women faculty members the ratio was 36.1 to 63.9, for men the comparable ratio was 36.9 to 63.1. These proportions were a change from 1973 when women comprised 34 percent of the part-time staff and 33 percent of the full-time (Illinois Junior College Board, 1974). From incomplete data Phair (1971) found that for day classes in the large urban California colleges the proportion of women to men got as high as 43.7 to 56.3; in the rural colleges the proportion dropped as low as 14 to 86. On the basis of the Illinois study one

may conjecture that for part-time faculty the proportion of women to men would be comparable to that for day faculty (1971).

TABLE VI

Number and Percentage of Female and Male Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty in Illinois Community Colleges 1974

Sex	Number Full-Time Faculty	Percent of Full-Time	Number Part-Time Faculty	Percent of Part-Time	Number Total Faculty	Ratio Full-Time to Part-Time	Percent of Total Faculty
Female	1,558	34.5%	2,761	35.3%	4,319	36.1 to 63.9	35.0%
Male	2,963	65.5%	5,060	64.7%	8,023	36.9 to 63.1	65.0%
Total	4,521	100	7,821	100	12,342	36.6 to 63.4	100

Source: Illinois Community College Board, 1975, p. 11.

Retired faculty have not been a significant source of part-time instructors (Bender and Breuder, 1973). In a few colleges they are given the opportunity to continue teaching (Hutchinson Community Junior College, 1973), but most retirees are more likely to be occasional day-to-day substitutes, particularly where the amount of reimbursement they may receive is limited by law. Day instructors are a major source of evening part-time instructors, though they form a smaller proportion of the total, approximately 15-20 percent in Illinois and 24.7 percent (6,286 of 25,371) in California. However, 45.6 percent (6,286 out of 13,788) of the California day faculty teach in the evening (Table VII).

For the immediate future part-time instructors will continue to be recruited from the above sources. The relative importance of each source will change, however, as a result of the increase in technical-vocational and adult education classes, adoption of prorata pay schedules equal to the full-time salary schedules, and continued high unemployment rate among teachers. Business and industry and the K-12 schools will remain among the principal sources for part-time instructors for the career and adult education courses. For the academic courses college graduates with

TABLE VII

Off-Campus Sources
Evening Part-Time Faculty
California Colleges
1974-75

Sources

	Other Colleges	K-12 Schools	Day Faculty	Non-Educational Fields	Total
Number	740	3,681	6,286	8,848	19,555
Percent	3.8	18.8	32.1	45.2	99.9
No Breakdown Available					5,816

Note: 11 Districts had no breakdown of Off-Campus sources and for 12 Districts the total was higher than the sum of the sources. In the tabulation above the Total represents the sum of the four sources.

Source: Ross, 1975.

teaching majors may become a major source if the teacher unemployment rate remains high. A worsening of the unemployment situation may lead to greater restrictions on the number of units that a day instructor may be permitted to teach on an overload basis and/or to the adoption by more colleges of the policy giving first priority to such positions to unemployed teachers. The switch to prorata pay may also affect the number of day instructors employed on overload assignments. With the removal of the cost incentive administrators may resort to the employment of recent college graduates on a major fraction of a teaching load or on a split day and evening program.

It is almost certain that full-time faculty will resist attempts to deprive them of their long-held priority position to part-time assignments but the pressure may be too strong for them to overcome. By demanding

prorata pay the faculty organizations are paving the way for their own displacement as evening part-time instructors. A few college policies and collective bargaining agreements already prohibit full-time faculty from overload assignments; more are placing tighter controls on the amount of such assignments. A concomitant of prorata pay, status as a regular member of the faculty, will make it difficult to bump such a part-time regular faculty member in order to give a full-time regular faculty member an overload assignment. It will be even more difficult in colleges where the part-time regular faculty are members of faculty organizations and the employee bargaining unit.

Qualifications of Part-Time Instructors

In discussions of the growing practice of hiring large numbers of part-time instructors, questions concerning their qualifications invariably arise and comparisons are made with the qualifications of full-time instructors. As with many evaluative judgments of educational practices there is little objective evidence to support the differing judgments. Most are subjective, often rationalizations to support one's opinion or practice. It is as unlikely for administrators to state that part-time instructors are not as well qualified as full-time instructors as it is for tenured faculty and their representatives to state the opposite. The truth of the matter is that "there is no statistical evidence that full-time faculty are any better than part-time people" (Harper, 1975, p. 8) or vice versa.

Yet there are many who insist that part-time instructors are more effective than full time instructors. Administrators of evening and adult education divisions maintain that part-time instructors put forth more effort in preparation and teaching than full-time instructors because they must satisfy the needs of the students or else lose them and their jobs. The full-time instructors protected by tenure are not under the same pressure; they retain their positions even if their students drop out.

Robert Theobald maintains that "certain types of knowledge and skill are best taught by practitioners who live in the world most of the time

and only enter the halls of academe occasionally" (1975, p. 6). In the same vein Bender and Hammons claim that "part-timers bring something new to the classroom--a breath of the real world, in the form of day-to-day experience in business, industry, government, or other educational experiences." They also assert that "since most adjunct (part-time) faculty teach because they want to, rather than to make a living, they tend to be extremely receptive to opportunities for self-improvement." In fact, they add, "they are remarkably similar to part-time students in their enthusiasm for learning" (Bender and Hammons, 1972, pp. 21-22). Williams, Evening School Dean at Penn Valley Community College in Kansas City, stressed that "the individual student is the benefactor of the skills and knowledge brought to the campus" by top level executives in many fields (1972, p. 83). According to Bahr, "non-professional teachers enliven the subject matter" (1969, p. 494).

Along the same lines a staff report to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges listed as "the most important benefit to students...the opportunity to study under outstanding instructors whose primary employment may be in industry or other postsecondary institutions." The report then adds, "typically, community colleges seek and select the best instructors available for part-time teaching" (Guichard and Others, 1975, p. 4), a statement which really says little about the quality of those selected since it must be assumed that community colleges also seek and select the best instructors for full-time teaching.

Countering these claims are the faculty who decry the proliferation of part-time instructors, maintaining that it is changing for the worse the nature of the community college and adversely affecting the quality of instruction (Weintraub, 1975). Some support for this opinion is provided by a study of 209 part-time instructors at four Midwestern institutions in which Seitz (1971) concluded that part-time faculty were less knowledgeable about the educational environment, less positively committed to junior college education, and held less favorable attitudes toward the institution.

It is ironical that many who are most prone to extoll the virtues of the part-timers and to make invidious comparisons with the full-time

instructors at the same time deplore the absence or inadequacy of induction programs--including pre-service, orientation and in-service. Nearly all investigators agree that "new part-time instructors receive a minimum of orientation upon appointment" (Kennedy, 1967, p. 15). Bender and Breuder concluded that "very little is done to assist part-time faculty to improve their instruction or to have a better understanding of the people they serve" (1973, p. 35). And since the people served also are poorly oriented, Bender and Hammons assert that "the beginning of the term is often a case of the blind leading the blind" (1972, p. 21). In his extensive study of procedures for supervision and evaluation of new part-time instructors Heinberg also found the situation less than ideal but his findings indicated that 51 of the 63 surveyed "had assigned one or more additional staff members to assist (the dean) in the supervision and evaluation of staff members" (1966, p. 241).

There are, of course, many reasons for the existence of this unsatisfactory method of inducting new part-time instructors into service. Cost, to the instructor, as to the college, is a primary cause. Part-time instructors, particularly those who hold prominent positions cannot afford the time involved in attending pre-service or orientation meetings. Some even begrudge the red tape involved in being assigned. Others do not feel the need for either orientation or in-service. Administrators who believe in the value of such programs are often disappointed at the poor response to their invitations.

Orientation, pre-service and in-service programs, if properly conducted, entail considerable cost in time and money for the college, a cost that many consider not justifiable by the returns. In addition some administrators believe that "the temporary nature of the appointment and the previous training and experience eliminates most of the need to include formal orientation program for part-time faculty members" (Kennedy, 1967, p. 15).

Despite the bleakness of the reports, improvements are being made. In many colleges secretarial, library, audio-visual and media services, as well as food services are being provided. A few assign chairmen or

coordinators to help part-time instructors especially during the first week or two of classes; a great many provide office space. And most colleges invite part-time instructors to their orientation meetings. Faculty manuals or bulletins are becoming a common means of orienting the part-time instructors to the college (Montgomery College, 1975). These are minimal, of course, and do not substitute for a more formal program. Since so much of the research and observations are judged by day practices for full-time instructors we cannot help pointing out that they, too, have been found wanting in many respects.

For the occupational and the adult programs the qualifications for part-time instructors are often different, neither better nor worse, than those of the full-time instructors even when the programs are the same. In these programs special skills or abilities may be needed. There is less concern about a part-time instructor's ability to teach any other subject or skill than the one for which he is employed. The administrator has more freedom in replacing a part-time instructor if his particular subject or skill is not needed. Not so, of course, for the full-time instructor. When he is employed the administrator must be assured that he is well versed to teach various subjects in a discipline or program in case he must be reassigned. In general the qualifications for initial employment of full-time and part-time instructors in the academic or baccalaureate subjects or disciplines are more likely to be similar than the qualifications for occupational, remedial or adult education subjects.

Academic Preparation and Experience

Comparisons of part-time and full-time instructors rely heavily on academic preparation and years of experience. They are easily quantifiable and the assumption, stated or not, is that the more graduate work the faculty have had, the better qualified they are. So too, but to a lesser extent, the more teaching experience, the better qualified. So well established are these criteria that nearly all full-time instructors and a considerable and growing number of part-time instructors are paid on the basis of them.

The studies on both academic qualifications and teaching experience show that part-time instructors have earned fewer graduate degrees or graduate units and possess less teaching experience than full-time instructors. Seitz (1971) reported that the part-time faculty of four Midwestern public junior colleges were not as well prepared either academically or experientially, as full-time employees. A 1964 study of part-time instructors in 11 of the 12 Maryland two-year colleges showed that 75 percent had a master's degree and 18 percent a doctor's degree. The cumulative percentage of 93 compares favorably with the Illinois reports of 93 percent in 1967 and 95 percent in 1970 for full-time instructors. Kennedy attributed the high percentage of Maryland part-timers "to the presence of many research-oriented government agencies" that were the source of supply. More in consonance with other studies was his finding that in 19 of the 26 Illinois colleges 78 percent of the part-time instructors had a master's degree and 4 percent a doctor's degree (Kennedy, 1967, p. 15). Bender and Breuder's study of part-time instructors in 139 two-year colleges employing more part-time than full-time instructors showed that in 1972 only 65.4 percent had graduate degrees, 23.6 percent had bachelor's degrees and 11.3 percent had less than a baccalaureate degree. The authors conjectured that those with less than a baccalaureate taught "in the area of occupational education" (1973, p. 34). A summary of teaching faculty preparation in the Illinois public junior colleges for 1967 showed that 76 percent of the part-time faculty had a master's degree or doctorate compared with 93 percent of the full-time faculty. Faculty with only a bachelor's comprised 20 percent of the part-time instructors and 6 percent of the full-time instructors. For those with less than a bachelor's the percentages were 4 for part-time and 1 for full-time (Illinois Junior College Board, 1967).

In the 1970 Illinois Community College Board's Report on Selected Data and Characteristics, comparisons were made of the academic preparation of part-time and full-time faculty teaching in the various programs. Of the part-time faculty in the baccalaureate programs 84.4 percent had graduate degrees compared to 95.0 percent of the full-time faculty. For the staff teaching in adult programs (most of whom it is assumed were part-time

instructors) the percent with graduate degrees was 37.0 percent; those without a baccalaureate degree represented 21.8 percent of the adult program group, 1.6 percent of the part-time baccalaureate program group and 1.2 percent of the full-time baccalaureate program group (Table VIII).

TABLE VIII

Academic Preparation of Instructional Staff Teaching in Adult Programs, Baccalaureate Programs Illinois Public Junior Colleges 1970

	Part-Time Faculty				Full-Time Faculty	
	*Adult Programs		Baccalaureate Programs		Baccalaureate Programs	
Degrees	Percent	Cumulative Percent	Percent	Cumulative Percent	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Doctor's	1.0	1.0	6.6	6.6	7.3	7.3
Master's + 30 units	5.9	6.9	20.9	27.5	31.8	39.1
Master's	30.1	37.0	56.9	84.4	55.9	95.0
Bachelor's	41.2	78.2	14.2	98.6	4.8	99.8
Associate's	4.7	82.9	0.7	99.3	0.1	99.9
Less than Associate's	17.1	100.0	0.9	100.0	0.1	100.0

*These were placed under Part-Time on the assumption that most if not all, classes in Adult Programs were taught by part-time instructors.

Source: Illinois Junior College Board, 1971, Tables 19, 20, 23.

In spring, 1975, the Center for the Study of Community Colleges conducted a nationwide study of the faculty teaching humanities in all types of two-year colleges. Findings were that part-timers tended to be less likely to hold advanced degrees. Twelve percent of the part-timers held doctorates compared to 15 percent of the full-timers (Cohen, 1975).

Studies of previous teaching experience and/or employment also show

that part-time instructors have less teaching experience than full-time instructors or are selected to a larger extent from non-educational sources. Two-thirds of the part-timers in the Center's study of humanities faculty had less than five years teaching experience whereas only 37 percent of the full-time faculty were in this category. For 19 percent of the part-timers, their assignment in 1974-75 was their first ever.

These findings are corroborated in state reports. Kennedy found that 28 percent of the Illinois part-time faculty and 30 percent of the Maryland part-time faculty had had no teaching experience (1967). In Illinois in 1966, 63.8 percent of the part-time faculty came from educational institutions (elementary school to senior college) while 70.1 percent of the full-time faculty came from the same institutions. Presumably the great majority of these employees were engaged in teaching. Significantly, of the remainder, 10.1 percent of the full-time had no previous employment. For part-time instructors none was listed in this category. Among the part-time instructors, 23.6 came from business and industry while for full-time instructors the percentage was 12.5 percent. The number of those who were recruited from non-educational institutions who had no teaching experience can only be a guess, probably a high percentage of the total. The next year the institutions of prior appointment of new professional personnel showed that 57 percent of the part-time were employed in an educational institution while for full-time the percentage was 73 (Illinois Junior College Board, 1967).

In their broader study, Bender and Breuder found that the percentage of part-time instructors with no or little teaching experience was smaller than the Kennedy and Illinois studies. In the 119 colleges that responded to the teaching experience question, only 6.8 percent of the part-time faculty had less than one year prior teaching experience while 42.7 percent had more than five years. Those with one to two years represented 14.3 percent of the total and those with two to five years represented 35.2 percent. The conclusion to be drawn from this sampling is that the percentage of inexperienced part-time instructors has declined during the past decade (Bender and Breuder, 1973).

In sum, it is not surprising that part-time instructors as a group are not as well-endowed with degrees and years of experience as the full-time instructors. The requirements for teachers of part-time classes are often not as high as for full-time teachers, particularly for teachers of occupational and adult education courses. Many of those teaching vocational-technical and apprenticeship courses day or evening do not have nor are they required to have degrees. For them non-educational experience in the trade or profession, journeyman's status and/or license to practice the trade or profession are equivalent to degrees and are taken into consideration at the time of employment and for placement on the salary schedule. Degree requirements for adult education program instructors are also lower than for academic program instructors.

Since the turnover among part-time instructors is and will continue to be higher than among full-time instructors the teaching experience of part-time instructors will be lower than that of full-time instructors. The high turnover is caused by several factors, not least of which is the lack of job protection; not only may part-time instructors be dropped at the end of a semester or year without cause, but when staff cuts have to be made for reasons of inadequate enrollment or insufficient funds they are the first to be dismissed. However, the percentage of part-time instructors with no teaching experience is lower than was the case during the teacher shortage of the 1950's and 1960's.

The attempt to judge the relative quality of day and part-time faculty seems a futile exercise because of the inadequate evaluation techniques and criteria. If degrees and experience are used as measures, the part-time group certainly falls short. But many of them are young and still working on higher degrees; they have to start teaching somewhere and two-year colleges offer them that opportunity.

Part-Time Wage Rates

Until recently, salary data for part-time faculty were not as readily available as for full-time instructors. However, the situation is changing as a result of the large growth in part-time faculty and the concern of

full-time instructors who are fearful that the lower-paid faculty may undermine salaries. Consequently they are paying greater attention to part-time pay, particularly to the ratio of part-time pay to the prorata portion of full-time pay.

Part-time rates are now included in most policy manuals and in some collective bargaining contracts. Whereas formerly they tended to be uniform for all instructors and calculated on an hour basis, today they are as complex as the salary schedules of full-time instructors. Instead of one schedule there may be several--for full-time instructors teaching overload classes, for day part-time instructors, for evening instructors, for credit and non-credit courses, for occupational courses, and for academic courses. Further, class size may affect the rate of pay.

In some collective bargaining agreements part-time salary rates for non-regular faculty members are not subject to negotiation but the minimum and maximum may be. In the Macomb County Community College (Michigan) agreement a section reads "Salaries for part-time teaching shall be set high enough to constitute employment competition but not so high as to constitute discrimination against teachers in the bargaining unit" (1972, p. 2). Where overload rates for full-time instructors are different from rates for part-time instructors, they are usually higher. Occasionally, rates for day part-time instructors are higher than those for evening instructors, particularly when they qualify for prorata pay. In no instance is the part-time (or overload) rate higher than the equated full-time salary.

The industrial pattern of higher rates for overtime has not been adopted by or forced upon educational institutions. This may be an acknowledgment that overtime is not an onerous activity, even that it is an easy method of increasing one's pay. Perhaps it results from a fear that overtime pay may lead to the hiring of outsiders or to elimination of overtime work by hiring full-time instructors. Not only would full-time day instructors thereby lose the opportunity for extra pay, they would lose the advantage of using these assignments as a buffer when reduction in force becomes necessary since such assignments are commonly

used to complete a full-time instructor's program that is below the normal for a full load. Whatever the reasons, higher rates for overtime teaching seems not to be a considered issue. In contrast, the nonprofessionals--maintenance personnel, secretaries, technical personnel--are often paid higher overtime or differential rates for work beyond the normal day or assignments in the evening hours. This is particularly true of those nonprofessional employees who are union members and/or are working in classifications covered by regulations or laws requiring the payment of the prevailing wage rates of similar employees in private enterprises.

The logic supporting the lower pay for part-time work whether performed by regular or part-time instructors was and continues to be that the extra class assignment is less arduous or requires less responsibility from the instructor than does the full-time assignment of the regular instructor. The latter's classroom duties are supposed to represent only one-half to one-third of his full responsibilities. His other duties may include student advising at registration time and during the year, serving on committees dealing with curriculum, selection of texts, library books and other materials, departmental and college governance, and related activities. The part-time instructor is not usually required to maintain office hours or participate in other than his classroom activities. Moreover, since the part-time instructor often teaches a course that duplicates one he is teaching in the day at the same or another college, he presumably has to spend little or no extra time in class preparation or in making new quizzes or examinations.

Apart from the logic there is evidence that administrators are resorting to part-time instructors because their hour or semester rate of pay is only a fraction of the yearly rate of full-time instructors and their fringe benefits are either non-existent or fewer in number. A three-hour class taught by a part-time instructor on an hourly basis typically costs from one-half to four-fifths the cost of a similar day class taught by a full-time instructor on a yearly salary (Lombardi, 1973).

Wage Patterns

The three major wage patterns for part-time teaching are the hour rate, semester rate and prorata based on a proportion of the full-time instructors' salary schedule. The hour pay pattern is usually the lowest of the three and the prorata is the highest. Basic to the hour and semester rates and less so for the prorata are the definitions of hour as contact or credit. As the term "contact" implies, each hour spent in class is counted as an hour for pay purposes. For most courses taught by the lecture method one credit hour equals one contact hour. But a credit hour may involve more than one contact hour, as is the case in most laboratory and technical-vocational courses where it may require two, three or more contact hours. In courses that involve unusual preparation, as in some advanced science courses, or a large amount of paper correction, as in English composition, a contact hour is usually counted as more than one hour for pay purpose.

The oldest and still most widely prevalent pattern is the hour rate. Until recent years the hour rate was a contact hour rate and was uniform in amount per hour for all instructors whether they were full-time instructors or other staff personnel teaching an overload section or two, or persons not otherwise associated with the college. Today, the hour rate may be a credit-hour rate and it may have many variations.

In some colleges two or three different pay patterns are used. For example, the City Colleges of Chicago has an hour rate for adult and continuing education classes, a second lower hour rate for instructors in the Skill Center, a semester rate for outsiders teaching credit courses, and prorata for full-time instructors teaching credit courses as overload (City Colleges of Chicago, 1973-1975; Grede, 1975). Mercer County Community College (New Jersey) employs an hour rate for non-credit courses and a semester rate for credit courses (1971-1973).

Some colleges pay part-time instructors only for the days (hours) they teach, not for holidays that happen to fall on the days assigned. Other colleges (and the number is growing) guarantee pay for a certain number of weeks or number of hours per week assigned in a semester no

matter how many holidays occur during that period. The same variation in practice applies for absence due to illness or other emergency. In some colleges that have switched to the semester rate the hour rate is still used to pay such non-teaching personnel as librarians, counselors, media coordinators as well as instructors assigned laboratory classes.

The uniform hour rate is being replaced by a condensed version of the preparation-type salary schedule for full-time faculty. Instead of seven horizontal columns representing degrees and graduate units of study and 14 vertical steps representing years of experience the Sweetwater Community College District (California) salary schedule for certificated hourly service has three horizontal columns and three vertical steps (Table IX). Unusual is the Seattle part-time salary schedule which has eight horizontal lanes and 17 vertical steps replicating the full-time salary schedule (Seattle Community College, 1972-1973). Note that the Sweetwater part-time schedule has a lower rate for instructors assigned to laboratory classes than for instructors assigned to lecture classes, a rate that also applies to all certificated employees assigned to non-teaching duties such as library, counseling, reassigned time, curriculum development. Schedules based on academic rank--instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor--are also common particularly for full-time instructors teaching overload classes.

An unusual schedule of hour rates provides progressively lower rates for hours worked beyond six per week. Based on years of experience the rates up to six hours per week are $9.48, $10.16 and $10.84; from seven to 15 hours per week the rates become $8.75, $9.04 and $9.32 respectively; and over 15 hours per week they go down to $8.13, $8.41 and $8.69 respectively (California Community Colleges, 1973). The highest rates, though applying to all part-time instructors, are obviously beneficial to full-time instructors with overload assignments. The other rates are primarily for part-time instructors in trade and industrial classes, not on full-time assignment. This schedule may also be intended to discourage full-time instructors from seeking assignments beyond six hours per week.

Replacing the hour rate is the semester rate which provides a fixed

TABLE IX

Sweetwater Community College District
Salary Schedule for Certificated Hourly Service
Effective July 1, 1975

		1 Classification I & II	2 Classification III & IV	3 Classification V, VI, VII
Class A 1st six semesters	Lecture	$13.20	$13.90	$14.60
	Laboratory	11.60	12.30	13.00
Class B 7th through 12th semesters	Lecture	13.90	14.60	15.30
	Laboratory	12.30	13.00	13.70
Class C 12 or more semesters	Lecture	14.60	15.30	16.00
	Laboratory	13.00	13.70	14.40

sum per credit or contact hour per semester. A variation provides for payment on a 3-credit or 3-contact hours per semester assignment. Of 58 collective bargaining agreements surveyed for this study eight of the 17 that specified part-time rates were semester-based, seven hour-based, and two used both kinds of rates.

The semester rate is considered by full-time and part-time faculty members to be more appropriate to professional personnel than the straight hour rate which has overtones of a blue collar piece-work wage scale. Moreover, the semester rate is more like the annual salary principle of the full-time salary schedules. Under this schedule the part-time instructor receives a fixed sum for the same period as the full-time instructor No deductions are made for holidays or other reasons. Important also is the tendency for semester rates to be slightly higher than the hour rates for the same period of time and more likely to include some fringe benefits. The semester rate is sometimes reserved for full-time instructors teaching an extra class on an overload basis, part-time instructors not associated with the college in any other capacity being paid on an hour basis. However, this may be only a transitional stage before all part-time instructors are paid on a semester basis (or prorata to be discussed later).

Though national data on part-time salaries are limited in number and scope, there is little question that they have increased substantially during the past five years. The maximums have increased at a steeper rate than the minimums, probably as a result of the growing practices of adopting salary schedules with graduated rates and of paying laboratory instructors and counselors a lower salary than the academic instructors.

Because data in part-time salary surveys are converted from hour to semester rates or vice versa some distortion takes place. The distortion results from different academic calendars and pay periods that vary from 15 to 20 weeks per semester. Table X illustrates the hazards of converting from one scale to another. In California day instructors are paid for 40 consecutive weeks each year, 20 weeks in each semester. However, part-time instructors on an hour rate may be paid from 16 to 20 weeks per semester. Thus no uniform conversion scale applicable to all districts is possible. As shown in Table X the minimum semester rate, $247.90, applicable to all instructors converts to $12.39 per class hour using 20 weeks as the base and to $15.49 if 16 weeks is used. The maximum rates for nonpermanent and permanent instructors show a comparable differential. Converting from an hour rate to semester rate would result in a similar differential. Thus a $10 per hour rate could be within a range of $160 and $200 semester rate. These distortions notwithstanding, the conclusion that part-time salaries have increased steeply during the last five years still holds.

A correlation between part-time and full-time salaries is observable (Cuyahoga Community College, 1974). As full-time salaries rise, so do part-time, but not necessarily at the same rate. Neither do all steps in a salary schedule rise at the same rate. If part-time salaries have been low the tendency is to increase them at a higher rate than the full-time salaries, a practice that will become more pronounced as faculty push for equal pay for equal work and administrators try to forestall it by higher than normal increases. Where part-time salaries are increased at a fixed amount per hour or semester the result is a percentage increase inversely related to the size of current salaries. Thus at Fashion Institute of Technology (New York) the rise from $16 per hour in 1972 to $21 in 1974

TABLE X

Conversion of 1974-75 Semester Part-Time Rates to Hour Rates

	Semester Rates	Hour Rates	
		20-Week Basis	16-Week Basis
Minimum			
All Instructors	$247.90	$12.39	$15.49
Maximum			
Nonpermanent Instructors	$271.06	$13.55	$16.94
Permanent Instructors	$289.58	$14.48	$18.10

for step 1 represents a 31.3 percent increase while the rise from $26 to $31 for step 11 represents a 19.2 percent increase (1974).

There is a wide variation in pay schedules. Kent (1971) in a study of English teachers reported a range of $151 to $200 per semester hour; while Hopper (1973) found a range of $150 to $340 averaging $207 among the 68 of 98 California colleges responding to his questionnaire. In a nationwide survey conducted by Cuyahoga Community College (1974) the range for 47 colleges in 23 selected districts was $150 to $445 with an average of $238. All three of the studies converted hour rates and/or quarter rates into semester rates.

In the examination of collective bargaining agreements and salary schedules for 1974 (with a few for 1973) gathered for this study the wide variation in the hour and semester schedules for part-time salaries became readily apparent. The range of hour rates varies from less than $10 to a high of $32. Salary rates lower than $10 are reported but usually they apply to non-classroom personnel with less than a master's degree and to paraprofessionals. Except for the New York rates the range for most colleges is from $10 to $20 with most approaching a top of $15. The trend is upward toward $20. In his sample of nine California Districts, Ross (1975)

reported a range of $10 to $18.27 with a median of $13.45. The highest rates, those paid by the New York City community colleges, range on a 12-step scale from a low of $21 to a high of $32 based on years of service. The lowest rate, $21, is higher than the top rates of the great majority of colleges. Of the colleges surveyed for this study only the City Colleges of Chicago with a $20 rate for adult and continuation courses and Westchester Community College (north of New York City) with a rate range of $15.75 to $23.75 approach the lowest New York City rates.

The semester rates for one hour per week range from about $160 to $498 with the majority in the $200 to $300 range. The highest semester rate schedule examined had a range of $346 to $498 (Orange County Community College, New York), a four-step scale based on academic rank. Outside the New York City area the maximum rates are closer to $300 than $400 while the minimum rates tend to be close to $200. Only a few have a minimum lower than $200. As might be expected, colleges that pay the highest salaries to full-time instructors also pay the highest hour or semester rates. Colleges in or near New York City and the Chicago City Colleges have high salary schedules with a maximum of $33,475 for the City University of New York (1973-1975) and $25,540 for the City Colleges of Chicago (1973-1975).

Except where prorata is the method of reimbursement neither the hour nor the semester rates come close to the full time salaries. The highest rate $32 per hour yields a yearly salary of $15,360 based on 15 hours per week for a 32-week academic year compared with the maximum salary of $33,475. Using the same computation the lowest, $21 per hour, yields $10,080 compared with the entry salary of $12,700. This discrepancy between part-time and full-time salaries is not unusual, and makes it clear why administrators are employing part-time instructors in preference to full-time instructors. Administrators are aware that part-time instructors do not perform many of the duties and services of full-time instructors, but they are willing to forego these for the savings accruing from the differential in salaries.

Prorata

The third major variation among part-time salary schedules is the prorata schedule computed as a fraction of the current salary of the full-time instructors. Prorata may be across the range of the full-time salary schedule, matching column and step to the academic qualifications and experience of the part-time instructor (as was true until the Fall of 1975 in the City Colleges of Chicago schedule for full-time instructors teaching a class as an overload) or it may be based on a particular column and step of the full-time salary schedule usually at some point between the lowest rate and the middle rate (Wayne County Community College, 1973-1974). In other colleges part-time instructors teaching a specified portion of a full load (35 percent in the Minnesota Colleges) are paid a proration of the appropriate position on the salary schedule (Minnesota Junior College, 1973).

Prorata schedules are not common for part-time evening instructors since so few are assigned more than one or two classes. They are more common for full-time instructors teaching overload classes and for day part-time instructors, particularly in colleges operating under collective bargaining agreements. State laws, policies and collective bargaining agreements prescribe that part-time instructors teaching more than a specified minimum of a full-load be classified as regular instructors. As such they are usually entitled to prorata pay. Prorata rates that are based on a particular column and step of the full-time instructor salary schedule sometimes result in such a low rate of pay that an hour rate is substituted as an alternative. In another variation of prorata pay the salary is determined by dividing the annual full-time salary by 1000 (Westchester Community College, 1973-1976) or by multiplying by .0010125 the second contract step of the full-time salary schedule to which the instructor is entitled to by his academic credentials (Wayne County Community College, 1973-1974). Similar or even more complex formulas are used in other colleges.

Conversion to a prorata schedule for day part-time faculty is not complicated. Ross (1975) used three standards based on workload formulas

of 15, 25 and 30 hours per week. The 15-hour base includes only classroom teaching as the workload standard while the 25- and 30-hour bases usually include class preparation, correction of papers and examinations, services on committees, student advising and other duties. The 15-hour base is the one typically preferred by the faculty while administrators prefer the 30-hour base.

The three basic steps involved in determining a day part-time instructor's prorata salary and workload are: 1) rating in on the full-time salary schedule usually on the basis of academic preparation and years of teaching experience, 2) dividing the part-time teaching hours by the teaching hours of the full-time instructors of the unit--department, division or cluster and 3) multiplying the salary by the fraction. It is assumed that the part-time instructor's total workweek (classroom plus other duties) will be proportionate to the standard workweek of a full-time instructor. Example: assume that a day part-time instructor, assigned a 7-hours-a-week teaching load, is rated-in at $12,000; the normal full-time classroom teaching load, is 15 hours per week; the normal workweek is 25 hours. Then the part-time instructor's prorata salary will be $12,000 x 7/15 or $5,600. Since the standard workweek is 25 hours, the part-time instructor's workweek will be approximately 12 hours (25 x 7/15). The critical factor in this example is the teaching load formula which determines the part-time instructor's prorata salary. The only effect of a workweek formula of 30 instead of 25 hours is the addition of two hours to the workweek; it does not affect salary.

Determining the full-time instructor's overload class prorata pay is a little more complex, since his salary represents reimbursement for more than the classroom workload. The calculation of the number of hours that the non-classroom workload represents varies. During salary negotiations the faculty often claim that the non-classroom workload represents 20 to 25 hours. For prorata pay for overload classes they insist that the classroom workweek base be used. Some will concede that the hours required to be spent on campus is a more realistic base. The ultimate resolution of this difference in workweek will be somewhere between 15 and 20 hours,

although a 25-hour workweek may be an initial step in the transition to prorata pay for overload assignments and for evening division part-time instructors.

Table XI illustrates how the workweek base affects the part-time prorata salary for a 3-hour-per-week assignment for 32 weeks. For comparability with current hour rates the part-time salaries are divided by 96 hours (32 weeks x 3). Except for the lowest salary the three workweek bases yield hour rates that are significantly higher than the great majority of current hour rates.

Progress toward prorata pay is being made slowly. It is more likely to be adopted for full-time instructors teaching an evening class and for day part-time instructors than for evening part-time instructors. The financial difficulties arising from reduced state appropriations, inflation and pressure for limited funds from welfare and other public services makes progress even slower. Administrative resistance to prorata pay is strong for two reasons. One, and the most important, is cost; the other is tenure or job security that usually, but not necessarily, accompanies prorata.

Estimates on the extra cost of prorata pay vary depending on the full-time salary, the total number of part-time hours, and the full-time workweek base used. The lower the workweek base used for comparison with the full-time salary schedule, the higher the added cost. But even the highest salary rate of $32 per hour, comparable to a $15,360 yearly rate, is lower than the maximum of most salary schedules. Granting that estimates made by administrators may exaggerate the effects of prorata, the extra cost is substantial. The initial impact on the budget will be an increase of 50 to 75 percent for salaries of part-time instructors.

The chairman of the English department at the University of Pittsburgh estimated that the cost of prorata pay would increase his budget by $100,000 (Scully, 1975). Ross in his "Preliminary Report on Part-Time Faculty" found that for evening division only the extra cost for 1974-75 to 64 districts would rise from $32 million to $70.4 million to $214.4 million dollars as the workweek base used in the computation went down from 30 hours

TABLE XI

Selected Examples of Overload Prorata Salaries and
Hour Rates For A Three-Hour Weekly Assignment, 32 Weeks Per Year

Full-Time Salary	15 Hour Workweek		20 Hour Workweek		25 Hour Workweek	
	Part-Time Salary (F.T. Salary) X 3/15	Hour Rate (P.T. Salary) ÷ 96)	Part-Time Salary (F.T. Salary) X 3/15	Hour Rate (P.T. Salary) ÷ 96)	Part-Time Salary (F.T. Salary) X 3/15)	Hour Rate (P.T. Salary) ÷ 96)
12,000	2,400	$25.00	1,800	$18.75	1,440	$15.00
20,000	4,000	$41.67	3,000	$31.25	2,400	$25.00
30,000	6,000	$62.50	4,500	$46.87	3,600	$37.50

to 25 hours to 15 hours. His computations excluded fringe benefits of any type (1975).

Since the great majority of California teaching loads for full-time instructors fall within a range of 15-20 hours per week, a realistic estimate of the added cost would lie somewhere between the 25-hour and the 15-hour workweek base figures. Based on a higher salary schedule for 1975-76, the additional cost of the Los Rios Community College Certificated Employee Council proposal for an evening schedule equal to the regular session salary schedule was computed at $1,700,000 (Los Rios Community College District, 1975), a sum that would involve a property tax increase of $.09 per $100 assessed valuation or a decrease of 850 full-time equivalent student enrollment, assuming an average cost of instruction of $2,000. The enrollment decrease would also involve a decrease in the number of part-time faculty.

Notwithstanding the financial effects of prorata, faculty organizations in California, Illinois, Michigan, Washington and elsewhere are pressing for the change. The California and Washington organizations are banking on legislative and court action while the Illinois and Michigan groups find the bargaining table the most effective arena. So far, the bargaining table has been the most productive for the full-time instructors and for those part-time instructors teaching more than a specified number of hours per week.

In his fifth study on staffing trends in California, Phair reported that "there is an increasing trend in hiring part-time staff with a contract percentage of a teaching...load and paying a corresponding percentage of the yearly salary with incumbent staff responsibilities" (1974, p. 2), an indication that for day part-time instructors, administrators are receptive to proration. The Washington part-time teachers organization made some progress in getting the Legislature to earmark funds for improving the pay of part-time instructors, but the effects were not as favorable as expected. A California Superior Court judge on June 18, 1975 denied a claim for prorata pay for part-time instructors although in the same decision he ruled that part-time instructors do gather tenure rights

prorata to the time employed (AFT Community College Perspective, 1975). Under the new 1975 City Colleges of Chicago collective bargaining agreement prorata pay for full-time faculty teaching overload classes will be computed at 75 percent rather than the 100 percent provided in the previous contract (Grede, 1975).

Despite the California and Chicago setbacks, the trend is toward higher part-time rates that approach full-time salary equivalents. The argument for equal pay for equal work is difficult to challenge except on the grounds that if adopted it will result in a heavy drain of financial resources, so heavy in some cases that the amount available for staffing will be curtailed, leading in turn to fewer teachers--full- or part-time--and fewer students served. If we are to judge the reaction of faculty to these contingencies by the actions of employees in other industries in similar situations the consequences to students or unemployed teachers or finances will not deter them from their drive for equal pay for equal work. They liken the administrators' argument that "paying hourly instructors on a prorata basis would cost too much" to that "once used in support of the slave system, that it is cheaper" (AFT Community College Perspective, 1975, p. 1).

The actual rates paid to the regular faculty teaching overload classes tend to be, and will continue to be, higher than those paid to other part-time instructors. In some colleges the rates are set higher while in colleges that have adopted preparation-type schedules more full-time faculty than part-time faculty qualify for the higher rates by virtue of their greater experience and advanced degrees.

By 1985 or earlier, salaries for day part-time instructors will be proportionate to those for full-time instructors. This prediction is based on the significant progress so far made in this direction and the probability of general legislation or court action mandating equal pay for equal work. It is also reasonable to predict that for evening division instructors the hour or semester pay scales will continue to rise in line with or at a higher rate than full-time salaries. The prospect for prorata pay for them is slim although it cannot be ruled out

completely; an equal pay for equal work ruling could very well be broad enough to include them.

Summary and Conclusion

The number of part-time instructors has increased dramatically during the last five years. Whereas full-time instructors formerly outnumbered part-time instructors, in many colleges today they represent only about one-third of all instructors. Additionally, colleges are resorting to part-time instructors for day classes, a practice that was uncommon before the middle 1960's.

Part-time instructors for evening classes are recruited from K-12 schools, other colleges, business, industry, government, and recent college graduates. Day part-time instructors come primarily from recent college graduates, women, and a few from business, industry and government. Full-time instructors are an important source of part-time evening instructors.

Qualifications of part-time instructors--especially day part-timers--are only slightly different from those of full-time instructors in comparable teaching areas. On average, fewer part-time instructors than their full-time counterparts have advanced degrees; they also have fewer years of teaching experience. Aside from these data, the contention that part-time instructors are or are not as competent as full-time instructors is debatable, primarily because the criteria for competence vary and because few administrators or faculty members are willing to utilize sophisticated evaluation procedures.

Induction of part-time instructors into service involves little in-service training. Most receive hardly more than an hour or two of advice from a department chairman or dean. Efforts to institute formal in-service programs have been made but because of costs involved, lack of response from part-time instructors, and difficulties in arranging for sessions, they have not been very productive. It must be pointed out that in-service training programs for full-time faculty are not noted for their prevalence or effectiveness.

Working conditions for evening part-time instructors have improved markedly in such amenities as office space, lounging areas, and secretarial and food services. On the campuses of most colleges, supplies, equipment, and support from the library, media center, and other learning adjuncts are readily available. At least one administrative office staffed by a senior administrator remains open for part of every evening and during the early weeks of the semester departmental or other day faculty members are assigned to assist new part-time instructors.

At off-campus centers working conditions are far from ideal. Supervision is inadequate or nonexistent except for an occasional visit by an administrator or chairman from the main campus, and hardly any educational or personal support services exist either for the faculty or students. The management and the educational aspects of these rapidly expanding centers may develop into a scandal unless administrators direct more attention to them. It is anomalous for state and accreditation agencies to place such high value on supervision, the library, and educational resources on campus and disregard the effects on the educational program of their almost total absence on the off-campus sites.

The typical workload of a part-time instructor is between three and six hours per week. A few may work as much as 90 percent of a full-load. Limitations and restrictions on the number of hours a part-time instructor may be employed are common; a few colleges even prohibit full-time staff from accepting a part-time assignment. Much more frequently full-time instructors have first priority to at least one part-time assignment.

Pay for part-time instructors varies widely. It tends to be higher in metropolitan colleges than in suburban and rural colleges. Pay scales have increased markedly since the 1950's and since 1970 have included some fringe benefits. Of the three major methods of payment the hour rates are slightly lower than the semester rates and both are significantly lower than prorata scales. Few colleges use proration to determine part-time pay; where it is, the beneficiaries are likely to be full-time instructors teaching an overload class and part-time instructors teaching more than a specified fraction of a full-time load, usually during the day.

Non-teaching personnel, counselors, librarians, media coordinators are often paid less than classroom instructors. The hour rates range from less than $10 per hour to $32 per hour. The average for 1974 was close to $13 or $14. Semester rates for one hour per week ranged from $150 to $498 with an average close to $250.

The next five years will witness faculty organizations' sponsoring greater membership drives to recruit part-time instructors. Part-time instructors are ambivalent about their course of action. Considerable sentiment is developing for a separate organization but no trend is observable. In New York City the part-time instructors have formed a separate organization and still maintain membership or association with the organization of full-time instructors. Where day part-time instructors teach a percentage or number of hours specified in state law, college policy, or collective bargaining agreement they join the faculty organization. In an agency shop they have no choice since for all practical purposes they become members of the employee bargaining unit.

The objective of faculty association efforts is to achieve by legislation or bargaining "equivalent pay for equivalent work for all community college instructors." Additionally, they are pressing for other perquisites and responsibilities such as "due process, with the explicit requirement that they are hired and evaluated by the standards and procedures used for the full-time faculty. The responsibilities of part-time faculty should be prorata to those specified by the district for the full-time faculty and college committees, participating in curriculum development and meeting professional growth expectations" (FACCC Bulletin, 1975, p. 3). Though progress is slow these objectives are being realized by increasing numbers of part-time instructors. During the next ten years prorata salaries, fringe benefits and other faculty perquisites will be granted to a large percentage of part-time instructors, particularly those teaching day classes.

Indirectly, prorata pay may reduce the number of part-time positions since the cost advantage of splitting a full-time position into two or more part-time positions will be negligible. Also, if all teaching

assignments are paid on a prorata basis, the full-time day instructors will lose opportunities for part-time overload. Evening part-time positions will be used to complete the teaching schedule of day instructors without a full load. A third possibility is that boards of trustees will eliminate overload assignments in order to help relieve the high teacher unemployment rate. A few already restrict overload assignments, not necessarily for this reason.

Another probable side effect of the increased cost of prorata pay will be a reduction in course offerings, which in turn will induce a decline in enrollment, both in absolute numbers and in full-time equivalents. Only colleges with a sound tax base and/or with adequate state subsidies will be able to continue maintaining their present enrollment while paying prorata salaries. The present surge in enrollment, composed largely of part-time students, has been partly financed through savings made possible by hiring low-paid part-time instructors (Lombardi, 1975), a fact not widely publicized. For California colleges the savings effected by hiring part-time employees has been estimated to be within the range of $32 million to $375 million, depending upon the workweek base used. Since the average cost of educating a community college student is about $1,800, the number of full-time students involved is somewhere between 17,780 and 208,330.

As the movement toward equal pay for equal work gains momentum and acceptance administrators will have to look elsewhere to offset increased costs. In the past, state and federal aid could be counted on for added funds but during the past five years they have not been as generously available as during the 1960's. Tuition and/or fees up to a point will bring in more money but if these become excessive, they cause a reduction in enrollment and in state support which is based on enrollment. Of course, under certain conditions a decrease in enrollment may solve the financial problem, but few administrators would welcome a reduction in enrollment as a solution. The most obvious, and the most difficult, method of achieving savings is to change the method of teaching, a solution that has been suggested by Ruml and Morrison (1959), Coombs (1968), Machlup (1970), Cohen (1969), and others. The chances of this happening

within the next decade are extremely unlikely. Whatever the solution to the problem of added costs, one of the results is likely to be a change in the imbalance of part-time to full-time faculty in on-campus classes as fewer part-time instructors are employed.

Prorata pay or a salary schedule considerably higher than the present low scales of 50 to 75 percent of the full-time salary schedules is a reasonable expectation for part-time teachers during the next ten years. It will come by negotiation, by state or federal mandate, or through court action. Equal pay for equal work is a slogan ready made for moonlighters and part-timers. It has already become national policy for women educators under the Equal Pay Act of July 1, 1972 (Lester, 1975); extending the policy to part-time instructors should follow in the near future, thereby abolishing one of education's oldest practices. Such an accomplishment will take its place among those other faculty gains of lower workload, collective bargaining, right to strike, and higher salaries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AFT Community College Perspective, September 1975. Publication of Community College Council, California Federation of Teachers, AFT; AFL-CIO.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1974 Community and Junior College Directory. Washington, D.C., 1974.

Anderson, B. R. "Adjunct Faculty Deserve a Better Deal." Change, 7 (7): 8, 64; September 1975.

Bahr, J. "Non-Professional Teachers Enliven the Subject Matter." Clearinghouse, 43 (8): 494-496; April 1969.

Bender, L. W., and Breuder, R. L. "Part-Time Teachers--'Step-Children' of the Community College." Community College Review, 1 (1): 29-37; April 1973.

Bender, L. W., and Hammons, J. O. "Adjunct Faculty: Forgotten and Neglected." Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (2): 20-22; October 1972.

Blinderman, A. "Pedagogical Moonlighters: The University's Cheap Labor Reserve." Changing Education, 52 (36): 12-13; June 1971.

California Community Colleges. Faculty Salary Survey. California Community Colleges. 1973-74. Sacramento, California, 1973, 190p. ED 095 957.

California Education Code. Section 13337.5.

Charles Stewart Mott Community College (Michigan). Faculty Master Contract. An Agreement Between the Charles Stewart Mott Community College Board of Trustees and the Mott Community College Education Association. August 16, 1973 to August 15, 1975.

City Colleges of Chicago (Illinois). Agreement: Two-Year Agreement Between the Board of Trustees of Community College District No. 508, County of Cook and the State of Illinois, and the Cook County College Teacher Union, Local 1600, AFT, AFL-CIO, Chicago, Illinois. 1973-1975.

City University of New York. Agreement Between the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York and Professional Staff Congress/CUNY. 1973-75.

Cohen, A. M. Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College. Beverly Hills, California: Glencoe, 1969.

Cohen, A. M. "The Humanities Faculty." Speech to the National Humanities Faculty Conference, Atlanta, Georgia, October 4, 1975.

Community College of Baltimore (Maryland). Memorandum of Understanding Between the Board of Trustees of the Community College of Baltimore and the Community College of Baltimore Faculty Federation, Local 1980 AFT, AFL-CIO. June 1974.

Coombs, P. H. The World Educational Crisis: A Systems Analysis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Cuyahoga Community College (Ohio). Faculty Compensation Report 1973-1974. 1974, 25p. ED 088 553.

Erie Community College (New York). Collective Bargaining Agreement By and Between the County of Erie and the Faculty Federation of Erie Community College. 1973-1975.

FACCC Bulletin. Sacramento, California: Faculty Association of the California Community Colleges, April 1975.

Fashion Institute of Technology (New York). Union Contract. Revised: April 10, 1974.

Florida Department of Education. Ten Years of Selected Data for Florida's Public Community Colleges 1960-70. Tallahassee, Florida, August 1971.

Grede, J. Personal Communication. City Colleges of Chicago. October 1975.

Guichard, G.; Mangham, C.; and Gallery, G. M. Part-Time Employment, Item 8. Report to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, Sacramento, April 9-10, 1975.

Harper, W. A. "Advice From the Founding Fathers." Community and Junior College Journal, 45 (9): 8-10; June/July 1975.

Heinberg, S. Procedures for the Supervision and Evaluation of New Part-Time Evening-Division Instructors in California Junior Colleges. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966.

Henry Ford Community College (Michigan). Agreement Between the Board of Trustees of Henry Ford Community College and the Henry Ford Community College Federation of Teachers, Local 1650. 1973-1975. Dearborn, Michigan.

Hopper, F. L. A Study of the Policy of Hourly Wages for Part-Time Instructors of Community Colleges in California. Unpublished paper. 1973. 15p. ED 094 812.

Hutchinson Community Junior College (Kansas). Agreement Between Hutchinson Community Junior College Board of Trustees and the Hutchinson Junior Community College Faculty Association. 1973.

Illinois Community College Board. Faculty and Administrative Salaries in the Public Community Colleges of Illinois 1974-75. Springfield, Illinois, 1975.

Illinois Junior College Board. Faculty and Administrative Salaries in the Public Community Colleges of Illinois 1973-1974. Springfield, Illinois, 1974.

Illinois Junior College Board. Faculty Salary Survey 1971-1972. Springfield, Illinois, 1972.

Illinois Junior College Board. Faculty Salary Survey 1972-1973. Springfield, Illinois, 1973.

Illinois Junior College Board. Report of Selected Data and Characteristics, Illinois Public Junior Colleges 1966-67. Springfield, Illinois, 1967.

Illinois Junior College Board. Report of Selected Data and Characteristics of Illinois Public Junior Colleges 1967-68. Springfield, Illinois, 1968.

Illinois Junior College Board. Report of Selected Data and Characteristics of Illinois Public Junior Colleges 1969-70. Springfield, Illinois, 1970.

Illinois Junior College Board. Report of Selected Data and Characteristics of Illinois Public Junior Colleges 1970-71. Springfield, Illinois, 1971.

Kennedy, G. "Preparation, Orientation, Utilization and Acceptance of Part-Time Instructors." Junior College Journal, 37 (7): 14-15; April 1967.

Kent, T. H. A Study of the English Instructors in the Junior and Community Colleges. Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1971.

Lansing Community College (Michigan). Agreement Between Board of Trustees of Lansing Community College of the State of Michigan and Lansing Community College Chapter of the Michigan Association for Higher Education at Lansing Community College. September 13, 1971.

Lauffer, L. Personal Communication. Tallahassee, Florida: Division of Community Colleges, August 18, 1975.

Lester, R. A. "The Equal Pay Boondoggle." Change, 7 (7): 38-43; September 1975.

Lombardi, J. Managing Finances in Community Colleges. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Lombardi, J. Reduction In Force: An Analysis of the Policies and Their Implementation. Topical Paper No. 48. Los Angeles, California: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1974. 32p. ED 099 043.

Lombardi, J. Riding the Wave of New Enrollments. Topical Paper No. 50. Los Angeles, California: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1975.

Los Rios Community College District (California). Analysis of the Certificated Employee Council Proposal for the Year 1975-76. Sacramento, California, 1975.

Machlup, F. Education and Economic Growth. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1970.

Macomb County Community College (Michigan). Agreement Between Board of Trustees of the Community College District of the County of Macomb and Macomb County Community College Faculty Organization. 1972.

Madison Area Technical College (Wisconsin). Agreement Between the Area Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, District No. 4 Madison, Wisconsin and the Madison Area Technical College Teachers' Union Local 243. AFT, WFT, AFL-CIO: January 1, 1973 - June 30, 1974. Revised February 7, 1973.

Maryland State Department of Education. "Maryland Standards for Two-Year Colleges." Maryland School Bulletin, 44 (2), May 1969.

Mercer County Community College (New Jersey). Agreement Between the Board of Trustees of Mercer County Community College Operating Under Provision of Public Laws of 1968, Chapter 303 of the State of New Jersey, and the Faculty Association of Mercer County Community College: 1971-1973.

Minnesota Junior College. Professional Staff Contract Between Minnesota State Junior College Board and Minnesota Junior College Faculty Association. April 1973.

Montgomery College (Maryland). Part-Time Faculty Handbook, 1975-76. Rockville, Maryland, 1975.

Mount Royal College (Canada). Memorandum: Instruction of Community Service Courses. Calgary, Alberta, Canada, February 6, 1974.

Oakland Community College (Michigan). Faculty Master Agreement. September 1, 1973 - August 31, 1975.

O'Brien, F. W. "Due Process for the Non-Tenured in Private Schools." Journal of Law and Education, 3 (2): 175-202; April 1974.

Orange County Community College (New York). Agreement Between the Legislature of the County of Orange and the Staff and Chairman's Association of Orange County Community College. 1973-1976.

Phair, T. S. A Profile of California Community College Faculty. Berkeley, California: University of California, 1971, 16p. ED 049 760.

Phair, T. S. Staffing Patterns in California Community Colleges: A 1974-75 Overview. Sacramento, California: California Community and Junior College Association, 1974. 13p. ED 100 445.

Phair, T. S. Staffing Patterns in California Community Colleges: A 1972 Overview. Berkeley, California: University of California, 1972. 9p. ED 070 433.

Ross, D. M. Preliminary Report on Part-Time Faculty. Sacramento, California: California Community College Trustees, California School Board Association, May 22, 1975.

Ruml, B. R., and Morrison, D. H. Memo to a College Trustee. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Schenectady Community College (New York). Agreement Between the County of Schenectady and the Schenectady Community College Faculty Association. Covering Period from September 1, 1972 - August 31, 1975.

Scully, M. G. "Part-Time Teachers: Many Are Angry." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 9 (16): 1, 4; January 20, 1975.

Seattle Community College (Washington). Contract and Agreement: Seattle Community College Board of Trustees and Seattle Community College Federation of Teachers Local 1789. September 1, 1972 - June 11, 1973.

Seitz, J. E. Professional Orientations and Attitudes of Part-Time Junior College Faculty. Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1971.

Sweetwater Community College District (California). Salary Schedule for Certificated Hourly Service, 1975.

Theobald, R. "Helping to Create America's Third Century." Community and Junior College Journal, 45 (9): 5-6; June/July 1975.

Washington State Board for Community College Education. State Board Meeting Highlights. Olympia, Washington, January 23, 1975.

Washtenaw Community College (Michigan). Agreement. Washtenaw Community College Board of Trustees and Washtenaw Community College Education Association. 1973-1975.

Waubonsee Community College (Illinois). Two-Year Agreement Between the Board of Waubonsee Community College (Community College District No. 516) and Waubonsee Community College Faculty Federation, Local 2065. 1973-1975.

Wayne County Community College (Michigan). Master Agreement Between the Wayne County Community College Board of Trustees and the Wayne County Community College Federation of Teachers, AFT, Local 2000. 1973-1974.

Weintraub, H. "Part-Time Teachers Stirs Heat at Governor's Advisory Group." AFT Community College Perspective, 4p., April/May 1975.

Westchester Community College (New York). Agreement Between the County of Westchester and the Westchester Community College Federation of Teachers. September 1973 - August 1976.

Williams, F. N. "The Neglected Teachers: The Part-Time Faculty." Adult Leadership, 21 (3): 83-84; September 1972.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

DEC 31 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES